

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/575,981	04/17/2006	Vincent Jemelin	19724	8604	
SCHILLY SCO	7590 08/18/201 OTT, MURPHY & PRE	EXAM	EXAMINER		
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA AUGHENBAUGH, WALT			GH, WALTER		
SUITE 300 GARDEN CIT	Y, NY 11530	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		1782			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/18/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/575,981	JEMELIN, VINCENT		
Examiner	Art Unit		
WALTER B. AUGHENBAUGH	1782		

	WALTER B. AUGHENBAUGH	1782					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data- have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s est forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor		E below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	tucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		. ,	,				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 10.11 and 18.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach-	ed.				
11. M The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	DTO/SB/08) Paper No/e)						
13. Other:	i Torobrooj i apel NO(s).						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1782

/Rena L. Dye/

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the deletion of "with an impermeability... year" in claim 10 in the after-final amendment raises new issues that require further consideration and/or search because the recitation of a capsule that consists of cyclic olefin copolymer, but without any limitation regarding the permeability to moisture, has not been presented prior to this after-final amendment.

Additionally, new claim 20 was presented in the after-final amendment, but no finally rejected claim was cancelled.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's arguments, Examiner maintains the statements made in the Response to Arguments section in the Final Rejection mailed April 14, 2010. Berghahn teaches a polymeric bottle for storing medicine (to protect children from 'dangerous materials', col. 1, line 20) having no other required material other than a polymer. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized to have used the polymeric material taught by Sudo (cyclic olefin copolymer) as the polymeric material of the bottle of Berghahn for the reasons stated in the rejection of the three of the sudo.